

TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
Summary Notes/Minutes
Drama & Performing Arts Field of Study Advisory Committee Meeting
1200 East Anderson Lane, Board Room
Austin, Texas
September 24, 2018 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM
September 25, 2018 8:30 AM – 12:00 PM

The webcasts of these meetings are available at the following links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JstPbPX2g0Y>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FGYOHylqxE&t=2s>

Monday, September 24, 2018:

1. Call to order and introductions

Allen Michie called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

The following committee members were present:

James Ball, Texas A&M University
Russ H. Brown, College of the Mainland
Michael Burnett, Angelo State University
Patrick Bynane, Texas Woman's University
Charlotte Canning, The University of Texas at Austin
Jenny Corder, Hill College
Alison Frost, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
William Gelber, Texas Tech University
Yessenia Herrington, Central Texas College
Jami Hughes, Wharton County Junior College
Andrew Gaupp, The University of Texas at Arlington
Richard Jones, Stephen F. Austin State University
Shannon Kearns, Collin College
Karen King, Panola College
Tim Klein, University of Houston-Downtown
Melissa Marlowe, Alamo Community College-Northwest Vista College
Peter Mikolasky, The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley (ex-officio)
Daniel Nazworth, South Plains College
Kevin Patrick, Blinn College
William Peeler, Texas State University
Debra Schultz, Houston Community College
Matthew Smith, El Paso Community College

Coordinating Board Staff present:

Allen Michie, Program Director

Rebecca Leslie, Program Director

Rex Peebles, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Quality and Workforce

2. Consideration of appointing a recording secretary

Alison Frost volunteered to serve as recording secretary and was elected by acclamation.

3. Consideration of election of Co-Chairs

Kevin Patrick (Blinn College) was nominated to serve as co-chair from two-year institutions and was elected by acclamation. Michael Burnett (Angelo State University) was nominated from four-year institutions and was elected by acclamation.

4. Public testimony

No one was available to give public testimony.

5. Break for consultation between Coordinating Board staff and Co-Chairs

The committee recessed for 15 minutes.

6. Overview of Field of Study rules and mission – Dr. Allen Michie

Michie provided an overview of the Fields of Study (FOS) statute, how it is part of a wider range of transfer success initiatives, and how it contributes to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's 60x30TX strategic plan.

Michie stated the goals of the meeting:

- Review curricula from programs at representative two- and four-year institutions
- Review approved courses in the *Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual* (ACGM)
- Decide which lower division courses are necessary for success in upper division courses in a major
- Adjust course objectives and descriptions as necessary
- Balance student freedom with institution priorities
- Create a guaranteed pathway to the degree and minimize the number of excess hours that students take

Michie answered questions about FOS and the approval process.

7. Discussion and consideration of Drama & Performing Arts Field of Study curriculum

The committee began with a review of the Drama and related courses in the ACGM, assessing whether committee members felt each course could be nominated for the FOS.

Introduction to Theater (DRAM 1310): A majority said yes.

Theater Practicum I (DRAM 1120): A majority said yes.

Theater Practicum I-IV (DRAM 1120 1121, 2120, and 2121): A majority said yes.

Stagecraft I (DRAM 1330): A majority said yes. Jones said that the ACGM description is too broad. Burnett said that Stagecraft I is typically set building, and Stagecraft II is typically lighting. Peeler and others said this is not always true. Burnett said that members are agreeing that some kind of scenic construction technology course is needed in the FOS.

Stagecraft II (DRAM 2331): Kearns said that she was on the Learning Objectives committee

that defined this course, and it tried to accommodate the wide variety of programs in the state that did different things with this course. Gaupp said that both lower-division Stagecraft courses are essential for later upper-division Stagecraft courses.

Burnett rephrased the question as how many semester credit hours (SCH) in Technical Theater are needed at the undergraduate level. Schultz said that the committee first needs to decide if there will be multiple tracks. A majority of the committee agreed.

Burnett asked if there can be different tracks for Bachelor of Arts (BA) and Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA) programs. Michie said yes, so long as there is a significant difference in courses at the lower-division level. Gaupp said that at his institution there are different requirements for the BA and BFA, and he doesn't see how one plan will fit all programs. Bynane asked if there was a benefit to having an FOS for BFA programs since they generally require auditions for admission.

King added that there could be a different track for students pursuing teaching certification. There could also be a director/playwrighting track which teachers could also take. Jones said that a 26 SCH core could prepare teachers with a broad base. Nazworth said that his institution has only 12 SCH of Drama that it can teach.

The committee consensus was to have no FOS for the BFA. The consensus was to have three tracks for the BA: Acting/Directing, Design/Technology, and General Theater Studies/Teacher Certification Preparation.

Discussion turned to the number of SCH for each track. King proposed 22 SCH for all three tracks. Kearns suggested 19 SCH without the Introduction to Theater class, and Bynane made it into a motion.

Schulz said that 19 SCH is difficult for the community colleges because they often have only the 3 SCH courses.

Schultz made an amendment that the FOS be 22 SCH total without including Introduction to Theater. The amendment passed. The motion on making the BA FOS 22 SCH passed.

Burnett asked what tracks belong in the FOS for BA programs. Burnett made a motion to have the tracks be Theatrical Performance; Theatrical Design and Technology; and General Theater Studies. The motion carried.

Jones argued that Teacher Certification needs to be a separate category, as it is more specific in various skills courses than the general academic program. Schultz recommended dealing with these three tracks first and taking up the education component at the next meeting.

Michie recommended that each member send him a copy of an ideal FOS for each of three categories, and he would compile the results as a basis for discussion the next morning.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

Tuesday, September 25, 2018:

1. Call to order

Michie called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

2. Discussion and consideration of Drama & Performing Arts Field of Study curriculum

Michie showed the committee the overnight tally of votes. The committee discussed the most popular courses in turn.

Discussion started with the General Theater Studies track.

The committee consensus was to include Acting I.

The committee discussed the need to include the Practicum I, II, III, and/or IV courses. Bynane said that all four are needed. Herrington said that colleges do not always offer all four of them. Herrington proposed a menu of Practicum course selections. Burnett proposed that the 2 SCH Academic Cooperative (DRAM 2289) be allowed as an option if students take it twice, or a new ACGM course could be created with 4 SCH. Patrick suggested adding a new 1 SCH Cooperative course to combine with the 3 SCH Cooperative (DRAM 2389) to total 4 SCH in the FOS.

Discussion moved to Stagecraft I (DRAM 1330). Patrick said that Stagecraft I should be scenic only. King stated that the learning outcomes are vague and the course content should cover safety around scene construction. Burnett asked where costumes, lighting, and sound come in and how many SCH should be devoted to it in the FOS.

Jones said that it is important for receiving institutions to know what technical skills a student is bringing in at transfer. He added that Script Analysis is the most important course a Theater major needs to take. Ball said that the Script Analysis and Theater History courses are the only ones with substantial writing requirements, and at least one of these courses needs to be in the General Academic track. Marlowe added that Introduction to Theater has a writing component. Jones and Burnett said that requiring Theater History at the lower division is problematic. Kearns preferred to leave the History courses to the four-year institutions, but Canning said that if History is left out, some students (including transfer to The University of Texas at Austin) would have no Theater History in their degree programs. Gaupp said that excluding History is taught at the upper level at The University of Texas at Arlington, and the institution does not support it being taught at the lower level.

Patrick proposed 6 SCH in technical theater, 6 SCH in performance, 6 SCH in academics/analysis/writing, and 4 SCH in application. The proposal was endorsed by Bynane.

Jones moved that the committee revise the ACGM course descriptions for Stagecraft I and Stagecraft II (DRAM 2331) so they can be clearly delineated from one another.

Michie explained the steps for making changes to the ACGM, starting with a Learning Objectives committee for Drama that would study the syllabi currently used at institutions to see what

content is taught and how learning objectives are worded. The FOS Advisory Committee would need to give the Learning Objectives committee clear instructions on what it would like to see. King volunteered to coordinate the descriptions of the two Stagecraft courses.

Burnett asked if Stagecraft I should cover scenic/technology content, and Stagecraft II should cover painting and sound. Gaupp said that Stagecraft I could be orientation to equipment and materials (or an introduction to all areas of craft), and Stagecraft II could be an overview of advanced production techniques.

The motion to specify the ACGM descriptions of Stagecraft I and Stagecraft II passed.

Rebecca Leslie, Program Director at the Coordinating Board, addressed some of the issues relating to revising ACGM courses. Leslie said that Academic Cooperatives are about students going off campus to get work experience, they are very student driven, and no two Academic Cooperatives look like. They are a lot of work for the professor to monitor and assess the experiences. They are highly dependent upon the location of the school and how many local opportunities are available for students. A Cooperative is different from a Practicum, which is done on campus. Leslie also said that there would be challenges recommending a new ACGM course which is presented only as an option in an FOS.

Discussion turned to which courses would fulfill the 6 SCH of writing-intensive courses. Burnett proposed a new ACGM course in Script Analysis and a choice of Theater History I, Theater History II, Introduction to Cinema, and Introduction to Theater.

Marlowe responded to a question from Jones saying that students can be advised to choose courses depending upon where they plan to transfer. Patrick said that some of these courses are rarely offered but could map to other courses. Michie pointed out that Theater History II is offered at only six colleges and six universities.

Discussion turned to the courses to fulfill the 6 SCH of acting courses. The committee consensus was to include Acting I and a choice of Acting II, Voice for Theater (DRAM 2336), or Stage Movement (DRAM 1322).

Discussion turned to the courses to fulfill the 6 SCH of technical courses. The committee consensus was Stagecraft I and a choice of Stagecraft II, Stage Makeup (DRAM 1341), Introduction to Costume (DRAM 1342), or the new proposed Introduction to Design course.

Michie introduced Rex Peebles, Assistant Commissioner for Academic Quality and Workforce. Canning had earlier brought up the issue of a letter an institution sent to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) asking about whether FOS can threaten accreditation. Peebles responded that he has been working on a response to the letter. His response to SACSCOC is that the FOS is not new and that it has been in statute for 16 years. Faculty do all of the work to create the FOS. Peebles acknowledged that FOS marks a cultural shift for institutions that are accustomed to doing whatever they want to do, but the new reality is that 70 percent of students have courses from somewhere else. Transfer and swirling have increased dramatically in recent years, and non-traditional students are now in the majority. The common core and FOS are two ways in which the Coordinating Board is trying to help transfer students.

Canning pointed out FOS will not affect many students, and aligning a uniform selection of lower-division courses to the lowest common denominator will not improve excellence. FOS do not encourage expansion and adaptation. Canning also said that data about excess SCH is dubious because we do not have access to individual student transcripts. Peebles responded that the Legislature takes excess SCH very seriously. We need to be concerned about students moving through the system as seamlessly as possible, and FOS advisory committees should be asking what lower-division students need to be successful at the upper-division level. FOS are not designed to be static, and committees will update and review FOS at least every five years. Peebles also said that the problem with data on cohorts goes far back, but the Coordinating Board is focused on how to move forward. The assumption is that when students have a clear pathway, they have fewer excess hours and shorter time to degree. This has been established by multiple studies in other states with plans similar to FOS. Peebles acknowledged that FOS committee work is difficult, and he expressed appreciation for the participation of all the members.

Burnett asked if Makeup needed to be included in the FOS, and if so, in what section. After discussion, the committee took a straw poll. A majority indicated that it should not be required but remain a menu option.

Discussion turned to the General Studies track. Burnett proposed abandoning the other tracks and having only one FOS for BA programs:

- Acting I (3 SCH)
- Makeup (3 SCH)
- Choice of Acting II, Stage Movement, Voice for Theater (6 SCH)
- Stagecraft I (3 SCH)
- Script Analysis (3 SCH)
- Choice of Practicum or Academic Cooperative (4 SCH)

Kearns said that the Theater History and Introduction to Cinema courses can count toward the core, so students still have the opportunity to take them there.

Bynane made a motion to develop two more tracks: Generalist & Theater Performance, and Design Technology. The vote was tied. In further discussion, Barnett said three tracks allows more flexibility. Mikolasky asked if CIP codes can apply to multiple tracks, and Bynane responded that advisors will see the CIP code 50.05 and not look any further no matter how the tracks are specialized.

Bynane made a motion to have three tracks tied to three CIP codes: 50.0501 (Drama and Dramatics/Theater Arts, General), 50.0502 (Technical Theater/Theater Design and Technology), and 50.0506 (Acting). The motion failed.

Discussion turned to a single Generalist FOS.

Patrick suggested this FOS:

- Acting I
- Stagecraft I
- Script Analysis
- 9 SCH of DRAM Electives

- 4 SCH of Practicum/Academic Cooperative

Marlowe said that this would allow institutions to customize the courses for each four-year school.

King made a motion to accept Patrick's FOS. Kearns made a friendly amendment that the name be changed from a "General" FOS to a "Theater BA" FOS. The motion carried.

Marlowe made a motion that the FOS be tied to the following CIP codes: 50.0501 (Drama and Dramatics/Theater Arts, General), 50.0502 (Technical Theater/Theater Design and Technology), 50.0504 (Playwriting and Screenwriting), 50.0507 (Directing and Theatrical Production), 50.0509 (Musical Theater), 50.0510 (Costume Design), and 50.0599 (Dramatic/Theater Arts and Stagecraft, Other). The FOS would not apply to Theater Management programs. The motion carried.

Discussion turned to the proposed course description language for the new Script Analysis, Introduction to Design, and Academic Cooperative courses proposed for the FOS and the ACGM. Committee members read sample syllabi descriptions from their institutions. The consensus of the committee was to have the course description for the Academic Cooperative course be the same as for the existing Academic Cooperative courses, only to offer it at the 1000 level.

A motion was made to recommend a new Introduction to Design course for the ACGM and add it to the FOS. The motion carried.

3. Overview of the timeline for public comments and Field of Study approval – Dr. Allen Michie

Michie said that the proposed FOS would go out for a 30-day public comment period. Members are encouraged to distribute the proposed FOS to colleagues. Members will be asked to vote on each actionable recommendation received and may be asked to return to Austin to discuss making revisions to the FOS.

4. Consideration of authorization of Co-Chairs to approve minutes and final Field of Study documents

King made a motion to authorize the co-chairs to make non-substantive revisions and conduct other business on the committee's behalf. The motion carried.

5. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:00.

Final proposed Field of Study:

Course Title	Course Number	SCH
Acting I	DRAM 1351	3
Stagecraft I	DRAM 1330	3
Script Analysis*	DRAM 2XXX	3
Choose three of the courses below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to Theater • Stagecraft I • Stage Movement • Makeup • Introduction to Costume • Acting II • Stagecraft II • Voice for the Theater • Acting III • History of the Theater I • History of the Theater II • Introduction to the Cinema • Introduction to Design* 	DRAM 1310 DRAM 1330 DRAM 1322 DRAM 1341 DRAM 1342 DRAM 1352 DRAM 2331 DRAM 2336 DRAM 2351 DRAM 2361 DRAM 2362 DRAM 2366 DRAM 2XXX	9
Choose one of two sets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practicum courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Theater Practicum I ○ Theater Practicum II ○ Theater Practicum III ○ Theater Practicum IV • Cooperative courses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Academic Cooperative I (2 SCH)* ○ Academic Cooperative II (2 SCH)† 	DRAM 1120 DRAM 1121 DRAM 2120 DRAM 2121 [OR] DRAM 1XXX DRAM 2289	4
TOTAL		22

*This would be a new course proposed for addition to the *Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual*.

†The existing Academic Cooperative (2 SCH version) would be renamed "Academic Cooperative II" if the proposed new Academic Cooperative I course is approved.